

ZOLA'S BRAVE STRUGGLE.

THE FIGHT HE IS WAGING AGAINST SUPPRESSING THE TRUTH.

He Tells His Judges He Wants the Liberty of His Pen to Defend Himself—Count Esterhazy Accused of Committing the Crime for Which Dreyfus Suffers—He Must Justify.

Special Cable Despatches to The Sun.

PARIS, Feb. 8.—The trial of M. Zola has already developed one of the most extraordinary spectacles in modern French history. A single episode of to-day's exciting session will suffice to make memorable the hopes and struggles the great novelist is waging against the amazing and unjust conspiracy for the suppression of truth and justice by the responsible authorities of France.

The President of the court, at the opening of the session, repeated his decision not to allow any facts relating to the Dreyfus case to come before the court. Theroupin M. Zola, addressing his judges said:

"I expect to be treated as assassins and thieves are treated, to have like liberty to defend myself, to prove my good faith. A base press has treated me for months like a bandit, it has incited mob against me, and attacked me in a thousand ways. Now, to the court, I have come for my reply, I demand the right to make my defence."

The President said: "The Court has decided to the contrary by ruling out all facts foreign to the complaint of the Minister of War. You know the law forbids."

M. Zola replied: "I do not know the law, and I do not wish to know the law. I am interrupted by a violent demonstration on the part of the spectators. When he could make himself heard M. Zola continued: "Very well, I will make the jury the judges of my situation and leave myself in their hands."

The President thereupon sarcastically remarked: "Do what you like; draw whatever consequences you choose."

Another dramatic scene occurred when ex-President Casimir Perier, forbidden by the Court to answer the questions of M. Zola's lawyer, declared: "I am a simple citizen and am ready to obey the orders of the judicial authorities of my country."

THE DAY'S PROCEEDINGS.

The decision of the Court of Assizes in regard to the protest of M. Zola, counsel for M. Zola, against the absence of certain witnesses who had been summoned to appear was announced this morning. The court decided that the Minister and Major Patry de Clam should appear for their trial.

Yesterday's scenes of disorder near the Palace of Justice were repeated to-day by the crowds. M. Zola was greeted with cries of execration. The police repeated their performance of driving the mob away. At the opening of the session, the President of the court, M. Zola, declared: "I am a simple citizen and am ready to obey the orders of the judicial authorities of my country."

M. Clemenceau insisted upon the appearance of Esterhazy and also of M. Chabod, and the court ordered the appearance of the latter. The following persons are witnesses: M. Ormeu, M. Chabod, M. Lebrun-Renaud, Major Ravary, Gen. Merlier, M. Vallee, Col. Morel, M. Eckmann, Gen. Boisselard, Count Esterhazy, and M. Camille.

The court also appointed Dr. Floquet to ascertain the health of Messieurs Boulanger, Chabod, Camille, and others who had pleaded illness as an excuse for their non-appearance.

After the roll call of eighty-three witnesses the President questioned M. Dreyfus, but refused to put the questions offered by the defence, whereupon counsel for the defence protested.

The lawyers were in the room were much fewer today than yesterday. M. Dreyfus was dressed in deep mourning. She spoke in a broken voice. M. Zola demanded that M. Dreyfus should say what she thought of M. Zola's good day. She said she had heard of her husband's arrest, and what she knew of Major Patry de Clam. The President declared that there was no connection between these questions and the present case.

M. Zola replied: "I wish to have the same liberty that is granted to murderers and thieves to prove my good faith."

Dr. Floquet said: "We must prove that M. Dreyfus was innocently convicted. The evidence of M. Dreyfus is indispensable."

M. Clemenceau supported M. Labord, adding further arguments why M. Dreyfus should be heard. The excitement was intense, and counsel for the defence protested.

M. Zola addressed the public, saying that while he accused their holdings he was disturbed by the applause they had given to the enemies of his case.

A scene of tumult the court rejected the arguments of the counsel for the defence, declaring that no extraneous subject could be taken up.

Ex-President Casimir Perier was called to the witness stand. He was asked to swear on the ground that he could say nothing. He consented to be sworn and said: "As President of the republic, I never heard of the existence of Count Esterhazy or M. Dreyfus."

M. Labord questioned the ex-President relating to the communication of secret evidence to the judges of the court-martial, but the President of the court refused to answer the questions.

Advocate Labord, who had been with Col. Picquet, explained that Col. Picquet and M. Schœner-Kestner knew that the results of the inquiry had proved the innocence of M. Dreyfus and the guilt of Count Esterhazy.

M. Schœner-Kestner, until recently one of the Labord's statement and expressed a wish to read a letter written by Gen. Gossu to Col. Picquet, proving Count Esterhazy's guilt.

M. Labord asked M. Casimir Perier if he knew Esterhazy. The latter replied: "Duty prevents my saying the whole truth, so I shall say nothing."

This answer caused an indescribable tumult in the courtroom, and loud cheers were given for Count Esterhazy and against M. Zola.

M. Zola left the court immediately after the excitement, and was escorted by a crowd of students. There were a few counter-cries of "Vive Zola!"

M. Castro, as an expert in photography, declared that he was convinced of the identity of the handwriting of Count Esterhazy with that of the memorandum which was attributed to Dreyfus.

The proceedings were followed by a crowd of Zolaists and anti-Zolaists, who cried and retorts were mutually insulting. A party of the Republican Guard protected M. Zola from a hostile mob which was made up of him with a view of doing him personal injury.

It is now apparent that the trial will last for the Court's ruling. I shall employ practical measures to bring out the truth. We wish to know the truth, and we shall resort to other and more effective means which will be more fatiguing to the Court.

This means a long cross-examination of the military witnesses, and the Court ruled, must appear to-morrow.

M. Trarieux, who was Minister of Justice when Dreyfus was condemned, declared that he will testify that Count Esterhazy is guilty, and he will do so unless the Court orders him to say otherwise.

OPENING OF PARLIAMENT.

THE EARL OF KIMBERLEY CRITICIZES THE GOVERNMENT.

Lord Salisbury saw England's Treaty Rights Have Not Been Menaced in China—She Will Maintain Her Rights—Any Ports Russia and Germany Obtain Will Be Free.

Special Cable Despatches to The Sun.

LONDON, Feb. 8.—Parliament was formally opened to-day. The House of Lords and the House of Commons met at 2 o'clock this afternoon, the members of the lower house proceeding to the chamber of the House of Lords to hear the reading of the Queen's speech, which was printed in The Sun exclusively yesterday morning.

There was a full attendance of peers in the House of Lords. The Prince of Wales and the Duke of York were present. The galleries were filled with ladies. The address in reply to the speech from the throne was moved by the Earl of Hardwicke. The Earl of Kimberley, the leader of the Opposition in the House, referring to the proposal mentioned in the Queen's speech providing for local self-government in Ireland, said he was glad that something in that direction was to be attempted, but he was firmly of the opinion that the cry of the people was for a permanent solution of the difficulty.

As regards Crete, he said, the delay in the settlement of affairs there was to the discredit of the whole of the European powers. Peace, he declared, could not be restored until the Turkish troops were withdrawn from the island.

He deplored the Government's movements in the Sudan and criticized the Indian policy of the Government. The making of the Chitral road, he said, had encouraged the rising of the tribes.

Referring to the situation in the far East, Lord Kimberley said that when a responsible Minister spoke of war the country ought to be informed of the circumstances which made the position so dangerous.

Lord Salisbury agreed with Lord Kimberley that peace could not be restored in Crete until the Turkish troops were withdrawn, but that, he said, must be a matter of time.

Referring to the situation in China, Lord Salisbury said that British treaty rights were not menaced by any European power. He declared, however, that European statesmen had not appeared to have any intention of interfering with those rights. China, Lord Salisbury added, had asked Great Britain to guarantee a loan.

Lord Salisbury continued that extraordinary circumstances had arisen in connection with the conference having been held in Peking and the conditions to the opening of the port of Tientsin having been withdrawn. As far as he knew, he said, this statement was absolutely without foundation. Russia had given written assurance that any port she obtained leave to open to commerce would be open to all.

Lord Salisbury declared that the concessions asked from China in return for guaranteeing a loan were all directed to increasing and freeing British trade. They contained nothing injurious to British interests. He mentioned, with regard to other treaty ports, that the Chinese had declared that it would, for reasons that he was not necessary for them to enter into, embarrass them greatly if Great Britain insisted upon Tientsin being made a free port.

Lord Salisbury replied the next day that it was not his intention to question the opening of Tientsin, but he deferred until such time as a railroad might reach the port.

Lord Salisbury added that everybody acquainted with the district was aware that the country behind Tientsin was perfectly fertile, and that there can be no trade there until a railroad is built. A few days later China accepted the compromise. From that day on, said Lord Salisbury, he had heard nothing more about Tientsin.

Russia's assurance regarding ports had been given spontaneously. Germany even went further. The German Ambassador had informed him that the Germans were convinced that British treaty rights were better than their own, and they intended to maintain them.

Lord Salisbury promised to lay the papers before the House shortly, but he warned his hearers that they would not divulge more than he had revealed.

In discussing the Indian frontier campaign, the Prime Minister discovered a policy of conquest or a desire to increase the territory of the British Empire. In his speech, he had repeatedly warned the Government against the dangers of excessive acquisitions. Lord Salisbury declared that he heartily concurred with the noble Earl, and added:

"I believe there is danger in our public opinion. The danger is the danger of thirty years ago, when it was thought that it was our duty to fight everybody and take everything. I think that a very dangerous doctrine, not merely because we would thereby excite other nations against us—and the reputation we now enjoy in Europe is not by any means unimportant—but because there is a much more serious danger of overtaxing our strength."

"However strong we may be there is a point beyond which our strength does not go. It is courage and wisdom to exert that strength to its attainable limit, but madness and ruin to go beyond it. It is of extreme importance that we do not lose sight of this point."

Lord Salisbury continued that the danger of excessive acquisitions was not a new one, and that it was a danger which had been present since the days of the Crusades. He declared that he heartily concurred with the noble Earl, and added:

"I believe there is danger in our public opinion. The danger is the danger of thirty years ago, when it was thought that it was our duty to fight everybody and take everything. I think that a very dangerous doctrine, not merely because we would thereby excite other nations against us—and the reputation we now enjoy in Europe is not by any means unimportant—but because there is a much more serious danger of overtaxing our strength."

"However strong we may be there is a point beyond which our strength does not go. It is courage and wisdom to exert that strength to its attainable limit, but madness and ruin to go beyond it. It is of extreme importance that we do not lose sight of this point."

Lord Salisbury continued that the danger of excessive acquisitions was not a new one, and that it was a danger which had been present since the days of the Crusades. He declared that he heartily concurred with the noble Earl, and added:

"I believe there is danger in our public opinion. The danger is the danger of thirty years ago, when it was thought that it was our duty to fight everybody and take everything. I think that a very dangerous doctrine, not merely because we would thereby excite other nations against us—and the reputation we now enjoy in Europe is not by any means unimportant—but because there is a much more serious danger of overtaxing our strength."

"However strong we may be there is a point beyond which our strength does not go. It is courage and wisdom to exert that strength to its attainable limit, but madness and ruin to go beyond it. It is of extreme importance that we do not lose sight of this point."

Lord Salisbury continued that the danger of excessive acquisitions was not a new one, and that it was a danger which had been present since the days of the Crusades. He declared that he heartily concurred with the noble Earl, and added:

"I believe there is danger in our public opinion. The danger is the danger of thirty years ago, when it was thought that it was our duty to fight everybody and take everything. I think that a very dangerous doctrine, not merely because we would thereby excite other nations against us—and the reputation we now enjoy in Europe is not by any means unimportant—but because there is a much more serious danger of overtaxing our strength."

"However strong we may be there is a point beyond which our strength does not go. It is courage and wisdom to exert that strength to its attainable limit, but madness and ruin to go beyond it. It is of extreme importance that we do not lose sight of this point."

Lord Salisbury continued that the danger of excessive acquisitions was not a new one, and that it was a danger which had been present since the days of the Crusades. He declared that he heartily concurred with the noble Earl, and added:

"I believe there is danger in our public opinion. The danger is the danger of thirty years ago, when it was thought that it was our duty to fight everybody and take everything. I think that a very dangerous doctrine, not merely because we would thereby excite other nations against us—and the reputation we now enjoy in Europe is not by any means unimportant—but because there is a much more serious danger of overtaxing our strength."

"However strong we may be there is a point beyond which our strength does not go. It is courage and wisdom to exert that strength to its attainable limit, but madness and ruin to go beyond it. It is of extreme importance that we do not lose sight of this point."

Lord Salisbury continued that the danger of excessive acquisitions was not a new one, and that it was a danger which had been present since the days of the Crusades. He declared that he heartily concurred with the noble Earl, and added:

"I believe there is danger in our public opinion. The danger is the danger of thirty years ago, when it was thought that it was our duty to fight everybody and take everything. I think that a very dangerous doctrine, not merely because we would thereby excite other nations against us—and the reputation we now enjoy in Europe is not by any means unimportant—but because there is a much more serious danger of overtaxing our strength."

"However strong we may be there is a point beyond which our strength does not go. It is courage and wisdom to exert that strength to its attainable limit, but madness and ruin to go beyond it. It is of extreme importance that we do not lose sight of this point."

Lord Salisbury continued that the danger of excessive acquisitions was not a new one, and that it was a danger which had been present since the days of the Crusades. He declared that he heartily concurred with the noble Earl, and added:

"I believe there is danger in our public opinion. The danger is the danger of thirty years ago, when it was thought that it was our duty to fight everybody and take everything. I think that a very dangerous doctrine, not merely because we would thereby excite other nations against us—and the reputation we now enjoy in Europe is not by any means unimportant—but because there is a much more serious danger of overtaxing our strength."

"However strong we may be there is a point beyond which our strength does not go. It is courage and wisdom to exert that strength to its attainable limit, but madness and ruin to go beyond it. It is of extreme importance that we do not lose sight of this point."

Lord Salisbury continued that the danger of excessive acquisitions was not a new one, and that it was a danger which had been present since the days of the Crusades. He declared that he heartily concurred with the noble Earl, and added:

"I believe there is danger in our public opinion. The danger is the danger of thirty years ago, when it was thought that it was our duty to fight everybody and take everything. I think that a very dangerous doctrine, not merely because we would thereby excite other nations against us—and the reputation we now enjoy in Europe is not by any means unimportant—but because there is a much more serious danger of overtaxing our strength."

"However strong we may be there is a point beyond which our strength does not go. It is courage and wisdom to exert that strength to its attainable limit, but madness and ruin to go beyond it. It is of extreme importance that we do not lose sight of this point."

Lord Salisbury continued that the danger of excessive acquisitions was not a new one, and that it was a danger which had been present since the days of the Crusades. He declared that he heartily concurred with the noble Earl, and added:

"I believe there is danger in our public opinion. The danger is the danger of thirty years ago, when it was thought that it was our duty to fight everybody and take everything. I think that a very dangerous doctrine, not merely because we would thereby excite other nations against us—and the reputation we now enjoy in Europe is not by any means unimportant—but because there is a much more serious danger of overtaxing our strength."

ELECTRICIAN'S ODD DEATH.

W. A. McDOWELL KILLED WHILE BOILING INTO THE ELECTRIC SUBWAY.

Smothered by Sand When Flushing the Collar Wall of a Broadway Building Which Contains Many Aligned Shakes—The Victim Was His Object—Survives of the Fall.

Special Cable Despatches to The Sun.

LONDON, Feb. 8.—The Standard (Conservative) is displeased with Lord Salisbury's statement regarding China. It says: "It cannot be said that his tone of banter was either judicious or successful. His remarks are not to be taken as a serious statement. Even if there were no sign of a disposition to destroy or impair our covenant privileges in China, what is the world's war Sir Michael Hicks-Beach's motive in flourishing in the face of the universe a pledge to resist pillage to the death?"

"In the Standard's opinion, Lord Salisbury's statement is a serious statement. Even if there were no sign of a disposition to destroy or impair our covenant privileges in China, what is the world's war Sir Michael Hicks-Beach's motive in flourishing in the face of the universe a pledge to resist pillage to the death?"

"In the Standard's opinion, Lord Salisbury's statement is a serious statement. Even if there were no sign of a disposition to destroy or impair our covenant privileges in China, what is the world's war Sir Michael Hicks-Beach's motive in flourishing in the face of the universe a pledge to resist pillage to the death?"

"In the Standard's opinion, Lord Salisbury's statement is a serious statement. Even if there were no sign of a disposition to destroy or impair our covenant privileges in China, what is the world's war Sir Michael Hicks-Beach's motive in flourishing in the face of the universe a pledge to resist pillage to the death?"

"In the Standard's opinion, Lord Salisbury's statement is a serious statement. Even if there were no sign of a disposition to destroy or impair our covenant privileges in China, what is the world's war Sir Michael Hicks-Beach's motive in flourishing in the face of the universe a pledge to resist pillage to the death?"

"In the Standard's opinion, Lord Salisbury's statement is a serious statement. Even if there were no sign of a disposition to destroy or impair our covenant privileges in China, what is the world's war Sir Michael Hicks-Beach's motive in flourishing in the face of the universe a pledge to resist pillage to the death?"

"In the Standard's opinion, Lord Salisbury's statement is a serious statement. Even if there were no sign of a disposition to destroy or impair our covenant privileges in China, what is the world's war Sir Michael Hicks-Beach's motive in flourishing in the face of the universe a pledge to resist pillage to the death?"

"In the Standard's opinion, Lord Salisbury's statement is a serious statement. Even if there were no sign of a disposition to destroy or impair our covenant privileges in China, what is the world's war Sir Michael Hicks-Beach's motive in flourishing in the face of the universe a pledge to resist pillage to the death?"

"In the Standard's opinion, Lord Salisbury's statement is a serious statement. Even if there were no sign of a disposition to destroy or impair our covenant privileges in China, what is the world's war Sir Michael Hicks-Beach's motive in flourishing in the face of the universe a pledge to resist pillage to the death?"

"In the Standard's opinion, Lord Salisbury's statement is a serious statement. Even if there were no sign of a disposition to destroy or impair our covenant privileges in China, what is the world's war Sir Michael Hicks-Beach's motive in flourishing in the face of the universe a pledge to resist pillage to the death?"

"In the Standard's opinion, Lord Salisbury's statement is a serious statement. Even if there were no sign of a disposition to destroy or impair our covenant privileges in China, what is the world's war Sir Michael Hicks-Beach's motive in flourishing in the face of the universe a pledge to resist pillage to the death?"

"In the Standard's opinion, Lord Salisbury's statement is a serious statement. Even if there were no sign of a disposition to destroy or impair our covenant privileges in China, what is the world's war Sir Michael Hicks-Beach's motive in flourishing in the face of the universe a pledge to resist pillage to the death?"

"In the Standard's opinion, Lord Salisbury's statement is a serious statement. Even if there were no sign of a disposition to destroy or impair our covenant privileges in China, what is the world's war Sir Michael Hicks-Beach's motive in flourishing in the face of the universe a pledge to resist pillage to the death?"

"In the Standard's opinion, Lord Salisbury's statement is a serious statement. Even if there were no sign of a disposition to destroy or impair our covenant privileges in China, what is the world's war Sir Michael Hicks-Beach's motive in flourishing in the face of the universe a pledge to resist pillage to the death?"

"In the Standard's opinion, Lord Salisbury's statement is a serious statement. Even if there were no sign of a disposition to destroy or impair our covenant privileges in China, what is the world's war Sir Michael Hicks-Beach's motive in flourishing in the face of the universe a pledge to resist pillage to the death?"

"In the Standard's opinion, Lord Salisbury's statement is a serious statement. Even if there were no sign of a disposition to destroy or impair our covenant privileges in China, what is the world's war Sir Michael Hicks-Beach's motive in flourishing in the face of the universe a pledge to resist pillage to the death?"

"In the Standard's opinion, Lord Salisbury's statement is a serious statement. Even if there were no sign of a disposition to destroy or impair our covenant privileges in China, what is the world's war Sir Michael Hicks-Beach's motive in flourishing in the face of the universe a pledge to resist pillage to the death?"

"In the Standard's opinion, Lord Salisbury's statement is a serious statement. Even if there were no sign of a disposition to destroy or impair our covenant privileges in China, what is the world's war Sir Michael Hicks-Beach's motive in flourishing in the face of the universe a pledge to resist pillage to the death?"

"In the Standard's opinion, Lord Salisbury's statement is a serious statement. Even if there were no sign of a disposition to destroy or impair our covenant privileges in China, what is the world's war Sir Michael Hicks-Beach's motive in flourishing in the face of the universe a pledge to resist pillage to the death?"

"In the Standard's opinion, Lord Salisbury's statement is a serious statement. Even if there were no sign of a disposition to destroy or impair our covenant privileges in China, what is the world's war Sir Michael Hicks-Beach's motive in flourishing in the face of the universe a pledge to resist pillage to the death?"

"In the Standard's opinion, Lord Salisbury's statement is a serious statement. Even if there were no sign of a disposition to destroy or impair our covenant privileges in China, what is the world's war Sir Michael Hicks-Beach's motive in flourishing in the face of the universe a pledge to resist pillage to the death?"

"In the Standard's opinion, Lord Salisbury's statement is a serious statement. Even if there were no sign of a disposition to destroy or impair our covenant privileges in China, what is the world's war Sir Michael Hicks-Beach's motive in flourishing in the face of the universe a pledge to resist pillage to the death?"

"In the Standard's opinion, Lord Salisbury's statement is a serious statement. Even if there were no sign of a disposition to destroy or impair our covenant privileges in China, what is the world's war Sir Michael Hicks-Beach's motive in flourishing in the face of the universe a pledge to resist pillage to the death?"

"In the Standard's opinion, Lord Salisbury's statement is a serious statement. Even if there were no sign of a disposition to destroy or impair our covenant privileges in China, what is the world's war Sir Michael Hicks-Beach's motive in flourishing in the face of the universe a pledge to resist pillage to the death?"

"In the Standard's opinion, Lord Salisbury's statement is a serious statement. Even if there were no sign of a disposition to destroy or impair our covenant privileges in China, what is the world's war Sir Michael Hicks-Beach's motive in flourishing in the face of the universe a pledge to resist pillage to the death?"

"In the Standard's opinion, Lord Salisbury's statement is a serious statement. Even if there were no sign of a disposition to destroy or impair our covenant privileges in China, what is the world's war Sir Michael Hicks-Beach's motive in flourishing in the face of the universe a pledge to resist pillage to the death?"

"In the Standard's opinion, Lord Salisbury's statement is a serious statement. Even if there were no sign of a disposition to destroy or impair our covenant privileges in China, what is the world's war Sir Michael Hicks-Beach's motive in flourishing in the face of the universe a pledge to resist pillage to the death?"

"In the Standard's opinion, Lord Salisbury's statement is a serious statement. Even if there were no sign of a disposition to destroy or impair our covenant privileges in China, what is the world's war Sir Michael Hicks-Beach's motive in flourishing in the face of the universe a pledge to resist pillage to the death?"

"In the Standard's opinion, Lord Salisbury's statement is a serious statement. Even if there were no sign of a disposition to destroy or impair our covenant privileges in China, what is the world's war Sir Michael Hicks-Beach's motive in flourishing in the face of the universe a pledge to resist pillage to the death?"

"In the Standard's opinion, Lord Salisbury's statement is a serious statement. Even if there were no sign of a disposition to destroy or impair our covenant privileges in China, what is the world's war Sir Michael Hicks-Beach's motive in flourishing in the face of the universe a pledge to resist pillage to the death?"

"In the Standard's opinion, Lord Salisbury's statement is a serious statement. Even if there were no sign of a disposition to destroy or impair our covenant privileges in China, what is the world's war Sir Michael Hicks-Beach's motive in flourishing in the face of the universe a pledge to resist pillage to the death?"

"In the Standard's opinion, Lord Salisbury's statement is a serious statement. Even if there were no sign of a disposition to destroy or impair our covenant privileges in China, what is the world's war Sir Michael Hicks-Beach's motive in flourishing in the face of the universe a pledge to resist pillage to the death?"

"In the Standard's opinion, Lord Salisbury's statement is a serious statement. Even if there were no sign of a disposition to destroy or impair our covenant privileges in China, what is the world's war Sir Michael Hicks-Beach's motive in flourishing in the face of the universe a pledge to resist pillage to the death?"

"In the Standard's opinion, Lord Salisbury's statement is a serious statement. Even if there were no sign of a disposition to destroy or impair our covenant privileges in China, what is the world's war Sir Michael Hicks-Beach's motive in flourishing in the face of the universe a pledge to resist pillage to the death?"

"In the Standard's opinion, Lord Salisbury's statement is a serious statement. Even if there were no sign of a disposition to destroy or impair our covenant privileges in China, what is the world's war Sir Michael Hicks-Beach's motive in flourishing in the face of the universe a pledge to resist pillage to the death?"

"In the Standard's opinion, Lord Salisbury's statement is a serious statement. Even if there were no sign of a disposition to destroy or impair our covenant privileges in China, what is the world's war Sir Michael Hicks-Beach's motive in flourishing in the face of the universe a pledge to resist pillage to the death?"

"In the Standard's opinion, Lord Salisbury's statement is a serious statement. Even if there were no sign of a disposition to destroy or impair our covenant privileges in China, what is the world's war Sir Michael Hicks-Beach's motive in flourishing in the face of the universe a pledge to resist pillage to the death?"

"In the Standard's opinion, Lord Salisbury's statement is a serious statement. Even if there were no sign of a disposition to destroy or impair our covenant privileges in China, what is the world's war Sir Michael Hicks-Beach's motive in flourishing in the face of the universe a pledge to resist pillage to the death?"

"In the Standard's opinion, Lord Salisbury's statement is a serious statement. Even if there were no sign of a disposition to destroy or impair our covenant privileges in China, what is the world's war Sir Michael Hicks-Beach's motive in flourishing in the face of the universe a pledge to resist pillage to the death?"

"In the Standard's opinion, Lord Salisbury's statement is a serious statement. Even if there were no sign of a disposition to destroy or impair our covenant privileges in China, what is the world's war Sir Michael Hicks-Beach's motive in flourishing in the face of the universe a pledge to resist pillage to the death?"

"In the Standard's opinion, Lord Salisbury's statement is a serious statement. Even if there were no sign of a disposition to destroy or impair our covenant privileges in China, what is the world's war Sir Michael Hicks-Beach's motive in flourishing in the face of the universe a pledge to resist pillage to the death?"

"In the Standard's opinion, Lord Salisbury's statement is a serious statement. Even if there were no sign of a disposition to destroy or impair our covenant privileges in China, what is the world's war Sir Michael Hicks-Beach's motive in flourishing in the face of the universe a pledge to resist pillage to the death?"

"In the Standard's opinion, Lord Salisbury's statement is a serious statement. Even if there were no sign of a disposition to destroy or impair our covenant privileges in China, what is the world's war Sir Michael Hicks-Beach's motive in flourishing in the face of the universe a pledge to resist pillage to the death?"

ELECTRICIAN'S ODD DEATH.

W. A. McDOWELL KILLED WHILE BOILING INTO THE ELECTRIC SUBWAY.

Smothered by Sand When Flushing the Collar Wall of a Broadway Building Which Contains Many Aligned Shakes—The Victim Was His Object—Survives of the Fall.

Special Cable Despatches to The Sun.

LONDON, Feb. 8.—The Standard (Conservative) is displeased with Lord Salisbury's statement regarding China. It says: "It cannot be said that his tone of banter was either judicious or successful. His remarks are not to be taken as a serious statement. Even if there were no sign of a disposition to destroy or impair our covenant privileges in China, what is the world's war Sir Michael Hicks-Beach's motive in flourishing in the face of the universe a pledge to resist pillage to the death?"

"In the Standard's opinion, Lord Salisbury's statement is a serious statement. Even if there were no sign of a disposition to destroy or impair our covenant privileges in China, what is the world's war Sir Michael Hicks-Beach's motive in flourishing in the face of the universe a pledge to resist pillage to the death?"

"In the Standard's opinion, Lord Salisbury's statement is a serious statement. Even if there were no sign of a disposition to destroy or impair our covenant privileges in China, what is the world's war Sir Michael Hicks-Beach's motive in flourishing in the face of the universe a pledge to resist pillage to the death?"

"In the Standard's opinion, Lord Salisbury's statement is a serious statement. Even if there were no sign of a disposition to destroy or impair our covenant privileges in China, what is the world's war Sir Michael Hicks-Beach's motive in flourishing in the face of the universe a pledge to resist pillage to the death?"

"In the Standard's opinion, Lord Salisbury's statement is a serious statement. Even if there were no sign of a disposition to destroy or impair our covenant privileges in China, what is the world's war Sir Michael Hicks-Beach's motive in flourishing in the face of the universe a pledge to resist